

REMARKS**Oath/Declaration**

The Examiner has pointed out that the citizenship of the fifth inventor is missing. Accordingly, the executed Declaration will be separately filed in the near future.

Section 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 through 4, 6 through 8, 10, 12 through 15, 17 through 19, 21, 23 through 28 and 31 through 37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly obvious over the Baxter et al. reference in view of the Danneels reference. The Examiner has also rejected claims 5 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly obvious over the Baxter et al. reference in view of the Danneels reference and further in view of the Slade reference. Similarly, the Examiner has rejected claims 9, 20, 29 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly obvious over the Baxter et al. reference in view of the Danneels reference and further in view of Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary. Lastly, the Examiner has rejected claims 11, 22, 30 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly obvious over the Baxter et al. reference and further in view of the Nguyen reference. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the pending rejections.

For the rejection of pending independent claims 1 and 12, the Examiner has cited the Baxter et al. reference and the Danneels reference under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly obvious. The Examiner has pointed out that the Baxter et al. reference at column 7, lines 16-21 and column 9, lines 28-33 discloses a method of using a template to generate and update Web pages based upon specified trigger events that occur before a client requests the page. The Examiner has conceded that the Baxter et al. reference fails to disclose storing of "the page as one part in a table or storing an additional page based upon an update trigger call."

For the lack of the above disclosures, the Examiner has now cited the Danneels reference at line 14, column 1 through line 55, column 2. The Examiner stated that the cited disclosures teach the “condition depicting their generation and what would cause them to be accessed,” that are “contained within the database and associated with each version of the page.” Thus, the Examiner has concluded that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the method as disclosed in the Baxter et al. reference and the Danneels reference “because it would have allowed for pages to be preloaded that satisfy different conditions that are transparently mapped to a single URL. . . .”

Without admitting the above allegations, the Applicant has amended independent claims to further clarify the patentable features of the current invention. Newly amended independent claims 1 and 12 now each explicitly recite “storing . . . a file name of said generated dynamic page, said file name containing a page update trigger and a page generation call of said dynamic page as a part of said file names” for “a unique file name.” Lastly, newly amended independent claims 1 and 12 also explicitly each recite “outputting said stored dynamic page and the additional page in response to said user page access request containing said file names.” The above explicit recitations clarify that the current invention calls for “a unique file name” that includes “a page update trigger and a page generation call as a part of said file names” so that the user can access a particular one of the stored dynamic pages that have been previously generated.

In contrast to the above explicit recitations of the patentable features of the current invention, the Baxter et al. reference discloses a Web content management system. As the Examiner correctly characterized, the Baxter content management system separately stores the content formats and the contents. In response to a Web page request, the Baxter content management system dynamically generates a display content page based upon the format information of the content and the content formats as disclosed at lines 60-67, column 1; lines 1-11, column 2; and lines 4 -7, column 6.

Furthermore, the Baxter et al. reference also discloses content management control processes in which the Web page content is updated in response to an update trigger as described at lines 16-21, column 7 and lines 28-33, column 9. Lastly, the Baxter et al. reference discloses the dynamic generation of the customized Web page in response to a user request as described at lines 4-16, column 17. However, the above dynamic generation of the customized Web page is unrelated to the previously described updated Web page in response to the update trigger. In other words, the above dynamic generation of the customized Web page is not stored prior to a user request. As described at lines 4-6, column 6, “[t]he assembly procedure 70, in response to requests, pulls the content and format components from the repository 60 and provides the assembled web pages to a web site 80.” In the Baxter system, only components are updated and stored, but no Web page is pre-assembled and stored in advance of an access request.

In summary, the current invention as explicitly recited in newly amended independent claims 1 and 12 stores the Web page at a predetermine URL in advance of an access request. In sharp contrast, the Baxter system in fact teaches away from the pre-assembly and storage of the Web page as a whole. What is stored in the Baxter system is Web page components. Based upon the above patentable distinctions, the Applicant respectfully submits that the Baxter et al. reference fails to teach, disclose or suggest the very concept of storing and accessing the pre-assembled Web page at a predetermined URL.

Also in sharp contrast, the Danneels reference discloses a method of resolving a particular Web page entry based upon a condition and a URL. In other words, a plurality of Web pages are mapped to a single URL, and a condition determines which one of the Web pages as illustrated in a flow chart of FIGURE 2. To select an appropriate Web page, the system has to “evaluates conditions of a selected Web page set based on [the] current state information database” as depicted in the step 110 of FIGURE 2. In general, the conditions may be dependent upon “the status of devices or users external to [the]

server.” For example, the state setting device might be “an environmental sensor, another computer system, another computer system, another electric device, etc.” The state setting signal includes “the on-line status of the content author of the web page sets.” Another exemplary setting signals include “the load of the server” to determine the transfer rate of the Web page content data.

In summary, the current invention as explicitly recited in newly amended independent claims 1 and 12 stores the Web page at a predetermine URL that contains “a page update trigger and a page generation call of said dynamic page as a part of said file names.” In sharp contrast, the Danneels system in fact teaches away from a single URL for accessing a Web page since it requires an additional condition to select a particular Web page. In the Danneels reference, a single URL alone does not resolve a particular page.

For the sake of argument, even if the two cited references are combined, the combined disclosures still fail to teach, disclose or suggest the explicitly recited patentable feature of the current invention to provide a “unique” file name that contains “a page update trigger and a page generation call of said dynamic page as a part of said file names.” Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art to provide the method and the system as explicitly recited in newly amended claims 1 and 12 based upon the combined disclosures of the cited references.

Dependent claims 2 through 11 and 13 through 22 ultimately depend from either of newly amended claims 1 and 12 and incorporate the subject matter limitations of newly amended claims 1 and 12. Because of the above reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits to the Examiner that the rejections of pending claims 1 through 22 should be withdrawn.

Similarly, newly amended independent claims 23 and 32 both explicitly recite “the URL’s containing an argument for a page generation as a part of the URL’s” for “unique URL’s.” As discussed above with respect to newly amended independent claims 1 and 12, the current invention as recited in newly amended independent claims 23 and 32 distinguishes the cited references. In other words, the URL’s are tantamount to a file name to locate a unique memory location where a particular Web page is stored. The above explicit recitations clarify that the current invention calls for “a unique URL” that includes “an argument” such as a page update trigger or a page generation call “as a part of the URL’s” so that the user can access a particular one of the stored dynamic pages that have been previously generated.


The cited references alone or in combination fail to teach, disclose or suggest any aspect of the above patentable features where the URL’s contain “an argument for a page generation as a part of the URL’s” for “unique URL’s.” In fact, what is stored in the Baxter system is Web page components while the Danneels system, a single URL alone does not resolve a particular Web page. The current invention as explicitly recited in newly amended claims 23 and 32 calls for “a unique URI” that contains an argument for a page generation as a part of the URL’s.” Dependent claims 24 through 31 and 33 through 40 ultimately depend from either of newly amended claims 23 and 32 and incorporate the subject matter limitations of newly amended claims 23 and 32. Because of the above reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits to the Examiner that the rejections of pending claims 23 through 40 should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request a favorable Office Action so indicating.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 3, 2004



Ken I. Yoshida, Esq.
Reg. No. 37,009

KNOBLE, YOSHIDA & DUNLEAVAY, LLC
Eight Penn Center, Suite 1350
1628 John F. Kennedy Blvd.
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 599-0600